UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/982,269	10/17/2001	Benoit Mory	PHFR 000110	7787

7590 10/07/2004

US PHILIPS CORPORATION
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPART
580 WHITE PLAINS ROAD
TARRYTOWN, NY 10591

EXAMINER	
STEVENS, ROBERT	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2176	

DATE MAILED: 10/07/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/982,269	MORY ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Robert M Stevens	2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *17 October 2001*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-10* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-10* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *17 October 2001* is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☒ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☒ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *10/17/01, 2/27/02*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-10 are pending in Application No. 09/982,269, entitled "Binary Format for MPEG-7 Instances", filed 10/17/2001 by Mory et al. Claims 1, 3, and 5-10 are independent.

2. The Office acknowledges two Information Disclosure Statements filed on 10/17/2001 and 2/27/2002.

3. Acknowledgment is made of applicant's claim for foreign priority based on an application filed in the European Patent Office (EPO) on Oct. 17, 2000. It is noted, however, that applicant has not filed a certified copy of the EP 00402876.7 application as required by 35 U.S.C. 119(b).

Drawings

4. Regarding Fig. 1, 5 and 6: No reference characters (refer to 37 CFR 1.84(p)) appear in these drawings and the associated specification. Reference characters are required to understand the Application subject matter.

5. Regarding Fig. 4, the steps discussed in the specification do not appear in the figure.

6. Figure 2 contains references to steps 2-1 thru 2-4. However, no lead lines appear from the steps to the referenced elements, as required by 37 CFR 1.84(q). Additionally, reference characters are not to be encircled, as per 37 CFR 1.84(p)(1).

7. Figure 3 contains steps 3-1, 3-2 and 3-4. "Step 3-4" appears to be an error. Additionally, no lead lines appear connecting the reference step numbers to the figure elements. Additionally, the empty boxes associated with the Fig. 3 steps require suitable legends, as per 37 CFR 1.84(o). Additionally, the underlining of reference characters is generally associated with a cross section (see 37 CFR 1.84(p)(3)), which does not appear to be Applicant's intent for Fig. 3.

8. Corrected drawing sheets are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as

per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Specification

9. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because it is not limited to a single paragraph of 50 – 150 words, and contains claim language. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

10. The disclosure is difficult to understand because multiple terms describe the same element in the figures (e.g., XML instance, XML hierarchy, hierarchical XML structure, XML instance XML-D, instance XML-C). This is the main reason why reference characters are required for the drawings (and the associated description within the specification). Proper use of reference characters ensures consistency in identification of drawing elements.

11. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

A. Page 12 line 22 references a "Step 2", which is not in the drawing; Applicant is reminded to please correct all spelling/grammatical/etc. mistakes throughout the specification (including the claims and drawings);

B. Page 4 line 33: An inferencing mechanism is alluded to, but not described here (see "inferred"). Is such a mechanism well known in the art? Please explain.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

12. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

> Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

13. **Claims 9-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101** for the following reasons:

Regarding independent claim 9, a "signal" is not tangibly embodied and its usefulness is unclear.

Regarding independent claim 10, the claim is to a "table", which is a software artifact that is not tangibly embodied.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

14. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

15. **Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph**, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 1-10 are vague and indefinite because these claims, either directly or indirectly via claim dependency, use the term "XML-like", which renders the scope indeterminable.

Claims 1-10 are also vague and indefinite because these claims, either directly or indirectly via claim dependency, use the pronoun "it", which renders the scope indeterminable.

Further regarding claim 2, there is a lack of antecedent basis for "A coding method as claimed in claim1".

Claim 9 recites an intended use for a signal, but the claim language does not set forth any limitations on such signal. This renders the scope of the claim indeterminable.

Claim 10 recites an intended use for a table, but the claim language does not set forth any limitations on such table. This renders the scope of the claim indeterminable.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

16. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

17. **Claims 9 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b)** as being anticipated by Gwendal Auffret, et al., (paper entitled: "Audiovisual-based Hypermedia Authoring: Using Structured Representations for Efficient Access to AV Documents", Hypertext '99, Darmstadt, Germany, Feb. 1999, hereafter referred to as "Auffret").

Regarding independent claim 9, Auffret discloses:

A signal for transmission over a transmission network comprising an encoder and/or a decoder (p. 175 "Structure encoding using XML") *having a memory storing at least one table derived from an XML-like schema* (Fig. 11), *said XML-like schema defining a hierarchical structure of description elements, said hierarchical structure comprising hierarchical levels, parent description elements and child description elements* (p. 174 Fig. 7, and first paragraph under "Temporal Model" re: "graph containing description object"), *said table containing identification information for solely identifying each description element in a hierarchical level* (p. 174 Fig. 7, and first paragraph under "Temporal Model" re: "graph containing description object"), *and structural information for retrieving any child description element from its parent description element* (p. 174 Fig. 7, and first paragraph under "Temporal Model" re: "reference links [structural information]"), *said signal embodying at least one fragment representing a content of a description element* (p. 174 "A segment" section, which also references Fig. 4, showing how sequenced segments are used in the building of a document), *called encoded description element, and a sequence of identification information being associated in said table to said encoded description element and its parent description element(s)* (p. 173 Fig. 4, and p. 173 Fig. 4 re: the last paragraph before the section entitled "Relating Descriptors to an Ontology" and discussing tree building).

Regarding independent claim 10, Auffret discloses:

A table (Fig. 11) *intended to be used in an encoder for encoding a description element of an instance of an XML-like schema, and/or in a decoder for updating a hierarchical memory representation of an instance of an XML-like schema* (p. 175 "Structure Encoding using XML"),

said XML-like schema defining a hierarchical structure of description elements, said hierarchical structure comprising hierarchical levels, parent description elements and child description elements, characterized in that it is derived from said XML-like schema (p. 174 Fig. 7, and p. 173 first sentence under heading "Overview of AEDI"),

and it contains identification information for solely identifying each description element in a hierarchical level (p. 174, Fig. 7 and first paragraph under heading "Temporal Model", re: "graph containing description objects"),

and structural information for retrieving any child description element from its parent description element. (p. 174, Fig. 7 and first paragraph under heading "Temporal Model", re: "reference links [i.e., structural information]")

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

18. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

19. **Claims 1, 3 and 5-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)** as being unpatentable over Gwendal Auffret, et al., (paper entitled: "Audiovisual-based Hypermedia Authoring: Using Structured Representations for Efficient Access to AV Documents", Hypertext '99, Darmstadt, Germany, Feb. 1999, hereafter referred to as "Auffret") in view of Simon

North, et al., (SAMS Teach Yourself XML in 21 Days, Sam's Publishing, Indianapolis, IN, (c) 1999, hereafter referred to as "North").

Regarding independent method claim 1, Auffret discloses:

A encoding method for encoding a description element of an instance of an XML-like schema defining a hierarchical structure of description elements (p. 175 "Structure encoding using XML"), *said hierarchical structure comprising hierarchical levels, parent description elements and child description elements* (p. 174, Fig. 7 and 1st paragraph under heading "Temporal Model" re: "graph containing description objects"), *said description element to be encoded comprising a content* (p. 174, Fig. 7 and 1st paragraph under heading "Temporal Model" re: "reference links [structural information]"), *characterized in that it consists in:*

using at least one table derived from said schema (Fig. 11), *said table containing identification information for solely identifying each description element in a hierarchical level, and structural information for retrieving any child description element from its parent description element* elements (p. 174, Fig. 7 and 1st paragraph under heading "Temporal Model" re: "graph containing description objects"),

encoding said description element to be encoded as a fragment comprising said content and a sequence of the retrieved identification information. content (p. 174, Fig. 7 and 1st paragraph under heading "Temporal Model" re: "reference links [structural information]")

However, Auffret does not explicitly disclose:

scanning a hierarchical memory representation of said instance from parent description elements to child description elements until reaching the description element to be encoded, and retrieving the identification information of each scanned description element,

North, though, discloses:

scanning a hierarchical memory representation of said instance from parent description elements to child description elements until reaching the description element to be encoded, and retrieving the identification information of each scanned description element, (p. 300, Figures 14.2 and 14.3 and description between and below those figures)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of North for the benefit of Auffret, because to do so would allow a programmer to traverse an XML document in a hierarchical fashion as taught by North in the 1st sentence under "OUTPUT Listing 14.7" on page 299. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., hierarchical processing of documents.

Regarding independent method claim 3, Auffret discloses:

A decoding method for decoding a fragment comprising a content and a sequence of identification information, characterized in that it consists in:

using at least one table derived from an XML-like schema (Fig. 11), *said schema defining a hierarchical structure of description elements comprising hierarchical levels, parent description elements and child description elements* (p. 174, Fig. 7 and 1st paragraph under heading "Temporal Model" re: "graph containing description objects"), *said table containing identification information for solely identifying each description element in a hierarchical level* (p. 174, Fig. 7 and 1st paragraph under heading "Temporal Model" re: "graph containing description objects"), *and structural information for retrieving any child description element from its parent description element* (p. 174, Fig. 7 and 1st paragraph under heading "Temporal Model" re: "reference links [structural information]"),

at each step searching in said table for the description element associated to the current identification information (p. 174, Fig. 9 and subsequent description under heading "Temporal Model" re: "reference links [structural information]") *and adding said description element to a hierarchical memory representation of an instance of said schema if not already contained in said hierarchical memory representation* (p. 173, Fig. 4, and p. 175 last paragraph before the italicized heading "A *segment*"),

adding said content to the description element of said hierarchical memory representation that is associated to the last identification information of said sequence (p. 175, last paragraph before the section entitled "Relating Descriptors to an Ontology", re: tree building).

However, Auffret does not explicitly disclose:

> *scanning said sequence identification information by identification information,*

North, though, discloses:

> *scanning said sequence identification information by identification information,* (p. 300, Figures 14.2 and 14.3 and the description between and below those figures)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of North for the benefit of Auffret, because to do so would allow a programmer to traverse an XML document in a hierarchical fashion as taught by North in the 1st sentence under "OUTPUT Listing 14.7" on page 299. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., hierarchical processing of documents.

Regarding independent claim 5, Auffret discloses:

> *A encoder for encoding a description element of an instance of an XML-like schema defining a hierarchical structure of description elements* (p. 175 "Structure encoding using XML"), *said hierarchical structure comprising hierarchical levels, parent description elements and child description elements* (p. 174 Fig. 7, and paragraph under "Temporal Model" re: "graph containing description objects"), *said description element to be encoded comprising a content* (p. 175 "Structure encoding using XML"), *characterized in that it comprises:*
>
> *a memory for storing at least one table derived from said schema, said table containing identification information for solely identifying each description element in a hierarchical level* (p. 174 Fig. 7, and paragraph under "Temporal

Model" re: "graph containing description objects"), *and structural information for retrieving any child description element from its parent description element* (p. 174 Fig. 7, and paragraph under "Temporal Model" re: "reference links [i.e., structural information]"),

computing means ...

and for encoding said description element to be encoded as a fragment comprising said content and a sequence of the retrieved identification information (p. 174 "A *segment*" section, which also references Fig. 4, showing how sequenced segments are used in the building of a document).

However, Auffret does not explicitly disclose:

> *computing means for scanning said instance from parent description elements to child description elements until reaching the description element to be encoded, and retrieving the identification information of each scanned description element,*

North, though, discloses:

> *computing means for scanning said instance from parent description elements to child description elements until reaching the description element to be encoded, and retrieving the identification information of each scanned description element,* (p. 300, Figures 14.2 and 14.3 and the description between and below those figures)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of North for the benefit of Auffret, because to do so would allow a programmer to traverse an XML document in a hierarchical fashion as taught by North in the 1st sentence under "OUTPUT Listing 14.7" on page 299. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., hierarchical processing of documents.

Regarding independent claim 6, Auffret discloses:

A decoder for decoding a fragment comprising a content and a sequence of identification information, characterized in that it comprises:

a memory for storing at least one table derived from an XML-like schema (Fig. 11), *said schema defining a hierarchical structure of description elements comprising hierarchical levels, parent description elements and child description elements, said table containing identification information for solely identifying each description element in a hierarchical level* (p. 174 Fig. 7, and paragraph under "Temporal Model" re: "graph containing description objects"), *and structural information for retrieving any child description element from its parent description element* (p. 174 Fig. 7, and paragraph under "Temporal Model" re: "reference links [structural information]"),

computing means for:

... , at each step searching in said table for the description element associated to the current identification information (p. 174 Fig. 9, and subsequent description under "A *segment*") *and adding said description element to a hierarchical memory representation of an instance of said schema if not already contained in said hierarchical memory representation* (Fig. 4),

adding said content to the description element of said hierarchical memory representation that is associated to the last identification information of said sequence (p. 173 Fig. 4, and p. 175 last paragraph before section entitled "Relating Descriptors to an Ontology" re: tree building).

However, Auffret does not explicitly disclose:

> *scanning said sequence identification information by identification information,*

North, though, discloses:

> *scanning said sequence identification information by identification information,* (p. 300, Figures 14.2 and 14.3 and the description between and below those figures)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of North for the benefit of Auffret, because to do so would allow a programmer to traverse an XML document in a hierarchical fashion as

taught by North in the 1st sentence under "OUTPUT Listing 14.7" on page 299. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., hierarchical processing of documents.

Regarding independent system claim 7:

A transmission system comprising an encoder as claimed in claim 5.

Claim 7 is substantially similar to claim 5, and therefore likewise rejected.

Regarding independent system claim 8:

A transmission system comprising an decoder as claimed in claim 6.

Claim 8 is substantially similar to claim 6, and therefore likewise rejected.

20. **Claims 2 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)** as being unpatentable over Gwendal Auffret, et al., (paper entitled: "Audiovisual-based Hypermedia Authoring: Using Structured Representations for Efficient Access to AV Documents", Hypertext '99, Darmstadt, Germany, Feb. 1999, hereafter referred to as "Auffret") in view of Simon North, et al., (SAMS Teach Yourself XML in 21 Days, Sam's Publishing, Indianapolis, IN, (c) 1999, hereafter referred to as "North") and further in view of Michael J. Hu, et al.,

(paper entitled: "Multimedia description Framework (MDF) for Content Description of Audio/Video Documents", downloaded from: arxiv.org/pdf/cs.DL/9902016.pdf, dated: Jun. 2, 1999, hereafter referred to as "Hu").

Regarding claim 2, which is dependent upon claim 1, the limitations of claim 1 have been previously addressed.

Auffret does not explicitly disclose:

> *characterized in that when a description element is defined in the schema as possibly having multiple occurrences, said table further comprises for said description element an occurrence information for indicating that said description element may have multiple occurrences in an instance, and when an occurrence having a given rank is scanned during the encoding, the corresponding retrieved identification information is indexed with said rank.*

Hu, though, discloses:

> *characterized in that when a description element is defined in the schema as possibly having multiple occurrences, said table further comprises for said description element an occurrence information for indicating that said description element may have multiple occurrences in an instance* (page 11, section 3.5, second paragraph: "Figures [sic] 7 show a .... a list [i.e., multiple occurrences] of multimedia documents ... in the content description"), *and when an occurrence having a given rank is scanned during the encoding, the corresponding retrieved identification information is indexed with said rank.* (page 11, section 3.4, second paragraph: "The target of indexing module is to automatically formulate indices of key descriptors")

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Hu for the benefit of Auffret in view of North, because to do so would allow a user to efficiently retrieve multimedia data or documents as

taught by Hu in the first paragraph of page 11, section 3.5. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., hierarchical processing of documents.

Regarding claim 4, which is dependent upon claim 3, the limitations of claim 1 have been previously addressed.

Auffret does not explicitly disclose:

> *characterized in that when a description element is defined in the schema as possibly having multiple occurrences, said table further comprises for said description element an occurrence information for indicating that said description element may have multiple occurrences in an instance, and when said sequence comprises an indexed identification information, said index is interpreted as an occurrence rank for the associated description element, same description element(s) of lower rank(s) being added to said hierarchical memory representation if not already contained in it.*

Hu, though, discloses:

> *characterized in that when a description element is defined in the schema as possibly having multiple occurrences, said table further comprises for said description element an occurrence information for indicating that said description element may have multiple occurrences in an instance* (page 11, section 3.5, second paragraph: "Figures [sic] 7 show a .... a list [i.e., multiple occurrences] of multimedia documents ... in the content description"), *and when said sequence comprises an indexed identification information, said index is interpreted as an occurrence rank for the associated description element, same description element(s) of lower rank(s) being added to said hierarchical memory representation if not already contained in it.* (page 11, section 3.4, second paragraph: "The target of indexing module is to automatically formulate indices of key descriptors")

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Hu for the benefit of Auffret in view of North, because to do so would allow a user to efficiently retrieve multimedia data or documents as taught by Hu in the first paragraph of page 11, section 3.5. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., hierarchical processing of documents.

Conclusion

21. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Non-patent Literature

Salembier, Philippe, et al., "MPEG-7: Multimedia content Description Interface, Introduction to MPEG-21 workshop, 20th and 21st of March 2000, Mar. 20 and 21, 2000, pp. 1-21.

Chiariglione, Leonardo (convenor), "Resolutions of 49th WG 11 Meeting", ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 29/WG 11 Coding of Moving Pictures and Audio, Doc. No. N2903, downloaded from: www.itscj.ipsj.or.jp/sc29/open/29view/29n32651.pdf, dated: Oct. 1999, pp. 1-15.

Martinez, José M. (editor), "Introduction to MPEG-7 (version 1.0)", ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 29/WG 11 Coding of Moving Pictures and Audio, Doc. No. N3545, Jul. 2000, pp. 1-10 (plus cover).

"MPEG-7: Context and Objectives (version - 10 Atlantic City)", ISO/IEC JTC1/SC29/WG 11 Coding of Moving Pictures and Audio, Doc. No. N2460, downloaded from: www.tnt.uni-hannover.de/project/mpeg/audio/public/mpeg7/w2460.pdf, dated: Oct. 1998, pp. 1-11.

Hunter, Jane, "MPEG-7 Behind the Scenes", D-Lib Magazine, vol. 5 no. 9, ISSN: 1082-9873, downloaded from: www.dlib.org/dlib/september99/hunter/09hunter.html, dated: Sep. 1999, pp. 1-12.

Vass, Jozsef, "MPEG-7: Multimedia Content Description Interface", downloaded from: meru.cecs.missouri.edu/mm_seminar/mpeg7.html, dated: Feb. 2, 1998, pp. 1-5.

Mulder, P., "The Integration of Metadata from Production to Consumer", EBU Technical Review, Sep. 2000, pp. 1-5.

Hu, Michael J., et al., "Multimedia Description Framework (MDF)for Content Description of Audio/Video Documents", DL '99, ACM 1999 1-58113-145-3/99/08, Aug. 1999, pp. 67-75 (plus citation sheet).

Staab, Steffan, "Intelligent Systems on the World Wide Web: 11 MPEG-7 Lecture Slides", downloaded from: "www.aifb.uni-karlsruhe.de/WBS/sst/Teaching/Intelligente System im WWW SS 2000/11-MPEG.pdf", dated: Aug. 23, 2000, slides 1-15 (plus Wayback Internet archive page and screen capture of pdf file URL).

US Patent Application Publications

Jain et al	US2001/0018693

US Patents

Mohan et al	6,748,382
Srivastava et al	6,549,922
Jain et al	6,360,234
Huang et al	6,593,936
Bergman et al	6,564,263
Sezan et al	6,236,395
DaGraca et al	6,646,676
Kumar et al	6,665,731

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Robert M Stevens whose telephone number is (703) 605-4367. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:00 - 3:30. After mid-October 2004, the Examiner can be reached at (571) 272-4102.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Feild can currently be reached on (703) 305-9792. The current fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306. However, note that the main number for Technology Center 2100 will be (571) 272-2100, as of mid-October 2004.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Robert M. Stevens
Art Unit 2176
Date: September 22, 2004

JOSEPH FEILD
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

rms